



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Monroe Doctrine." He says that it has abolished wars of conquest against weak and backward peoples, whose welfare shall hereafter be a "sacred trust of civilization," but he fails to show how this applies to Shantung. He tells us that "it has not put the United States where it can be coerced by an adverse majority, for all action is by common consent," a statement which overlooks the fact that if the United States be a party to a dispute it has no voice in the decision of the council, and that therefore it may "be coerced by an adverse majority." He says that the treaty does not affect the "constitutional right of Congress to declare war," a statement which is contradicted by our promise to "agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations" which will assume the right to decide when we shall or shall not go forth "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League." These statements are typical of the indiscriminating propaganda spread before the American people by the League to Enforce Peace and other agencies more enthusiastically partisan than enlightening.

The unthinking will-to-win in this controversy is not confined to the friends of the League. The Republican Publicity Association, with headquarters in the Continental Trust Building, Washington, D. C., has recently issued a pamphlet entitled, "Americanism with Peace or Internationalism with War?" This pamphlet presents the thesis that the "League of Nations means war, not peace." We are not overimpressed by some of their questions such as, "Is the United States likely to submit tamely when, perchance, those little Central American republics raise a question inimical to the welfare of our country, and proceed to outvote us five to one?" Suppose they do? The United States cannot afford to deny the principle that disputes may be submitted to outside parties for adjudication and that the judgment of such a body should be accepted. We have done just that thing too often for that. It sounds picayune to complain that the Secretary General of the League is an Englishman and that the seat of the League is to be 3,000 miles distant from our shores. The committee's criticism of article 12 is quite unjust. It says: "Suppose the dispute had been submitted to the council, then a period of nine months must elapse before a nation is permitted to vindicate its rights by force of arms. Meanwhile, it must stand idly by and witness perhaps the destruction of its civilization, the murder of its nationals," etc. The trouble here is that the committee fails to recognize that the League, being of universal application, would aim to prevent any such "destruction" before it could get under way. Its criti-

cism of Article 14, which article paves the way for an international court of justice, is strained and unwarranted. The judgments of courts have never led to wars. The committee, in its criticism of article 15, frankly stands for the indefensible principle that great States should have the privilege of interfering with the internal affairs of the small. We cannot agree with the committee that article 18 of the Covenant, by simply requiring the registration of all treaties, "transcends the treaty-making power of the Senate." In the criticism of article 22 the committee opposes the principle of mandatories, quite ignoring the fact that we have long functioned in that capacity in Cuba and other countries to our south.

Such statements do not help the case against the League of Nations. They harm it. The same thing is true of Senator Reed's outburst against the League, basing his argument on the fear of the domination of the League by the colored races. Senator Sherman's discovery that the League if set up would be dominated by the Catholics is an adventure in fairyland.

What the American people wish now is not friction, but light, not cheap politics, but exalted and intelligent statesmanship. The spinal cord is inadequate to the task of this treaty's interpretation. The demand is for brains.

"COMPROMISE AND BARTER"

READERS of this magazine familiar with the course which this Society follows must be aware that we have never advocated as our program for the peace of the world a League of Nations. We have stood rather for progressive adjustment under the Society of Nations which already exists, a union which has functioned from time to time in the Hague Conferences, in the establishment of a Universal Postal Union, indeed in resisting the onslaught in the great war. It has seemed to us easier, more logical, more promising to develop institutions already existing, tried and familiar, than to take up again the task of bringing a new Minerva out of a new head of a new Jove. That has always been difficult business.

We cannot now abrogate the faiths appearing on the second page of this magazine each month since the beginning of the war. Those principles cannot be abrogated. They are of the very essence of Anglo-Saxon civilization. They are imbedded there in our laws and political beliefs. They constitute the very structure of our business, our education, our religion, our social milieu. The League of Nations can neither abrogate nor alter them. They will alter the League of Nations.

The League of Nations is not our way, but it is a way. When the Senate is satisfied with it, it will remain for us to try it out. The thing it pursues is the thing we have long pursued. We must believe in the integrity and high purpose of the men who are trying to set it up. The League which they propose may not work at first. If we are unable to see how it can function, we may hope it will. In the long run it will be whipped into shape by the forces which have been operating through the centuries to the upbuilding of States. The attention of the world is centered upon our program as never before. In Burke's familiar words, "All government,—indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue, every prudent act,—is founded on compromise and barter." We therefore should be willing to compromise with our friends and hope for the speedy proof of the success of their ideals for the advancement of the common interests and of the permanent satisfaction of peoples. There must be a more intelligent international co-operation. Means should not be opposed simply because they are new. For the success of the thing itself, we shall continue to point out the difficulties as we see them. But intelligence is too pragmatic to content itself with being a mere dog in the manger. There comes a time in the affairs of men and of nations when it is well to recall that self-renunciation which brought genuine self-realization under the olive branches of Gethsemane.

We must get something. This League modified by the Senate will be all that we can get for the present, for it is the only thing concretely before the nations. League of the mighty only though it be, we may yet attain, perhaps out of it—who knows?—a real society of nations composed of free, equal, law respecting and forward moving peoples.

"Nobody who really knew anything about history supposed that Germany could build up a great military machine as she did and not refrain from using it." Thus spoke President Wilson to the soldiers and sailors aboard the "George Washington" on the Fourth of July. The President hits the nail on the head there. The same thing would be true of any nation. These big machines are made to use. If not used, after a certain period the time comes when they must be used or overthrown by those who pay the bills. The inevitable end of military preparation is military execution.

"We won the war" is on its reiterated and loathsome round among the nations. Mr. Wilson's statement to the soldiers and sailors on July 4, that "if it had not been for America the war would not have been won," met its Oliver immediately in the claim of General Haig that "England won the war." France knows that she won the war. Italy is as certain that she won the war. Japan won the war. Greece won the war. Let us brace ourselves. We must listen to it over and over again, the vain, ostentatious, self-admiring boast, "We won the war."

AMENDING THE COVENANT

By ELIHU ROOT

To the Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge,
Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR SENATOR: You were good enough to ask that, after studying the whole of the proposed treaty with Germany and the amendments already made to the League of Nations part of it, I should write you my opinion as to the amendments and as to the action which would be wise, in view of existing international conditions.

I should be glad to see the peace terms and the League of Nations covenant separated, as proposed in the resolution offered by Senator Knox, so that the latter could be considered by the people of the country without coercion from the necessities of speedy peace.

To avoid repetition, I inclose a copy of a letter which I wrote to Mr. Will H. Hays, March 29, 1919, proposing amendments to the League of Nations Covenant and giving the reasons for them. Amendments similar in substance were proposed at about the same time by many Americans familiar with public affairs both in and out of the Senate. The amendments subsequently made in the covenant by the Paris conference, while to some extent dealing with the subjects of the amendments so proposed, are very inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Nothing has been done to provide for the re-establishment and strengthening of a system of arbitration or judicial decision upon questions of legal right. Nothing has been done toward providing for the revision or development of international law. In these respects, principles maintained by the United States without variation for half a century are still ignored, and we are left with a program which rests the hope of the world for future peace in a government of men and not of laws, following the dictates of expediency, and not of right. Nothing has been done to limit the vast and incalculable obligation which Article X of the covenant undertakes to impose upon each member of the League to preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of all members of the League all over the world.

The clause authorizing withdrawal from the League on two years' notice leaves a doubt whether a mere charge that we had not performed some international obligation would not put it in the power of the Council to take jurisdiction of the charge as a disputed question and keep us in the League indefinitely against our will.

The clause which has been inserted regarding the Monroe Doctrine is erroneous in its description of the doctrine and ambiguous in meaning. Other purely American questions, as for example, questions relating to immigration, are protected only by a clause apparently empowering the Council to determine whether such questions are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. I do not think that in these respects the United States is sufficiently protected against most injurious results, which are wholly unnecessary for the establishment and maintenance of this League of Nations.